

work (*Hist. nat. Crustacés*) is shown in footnote (1) to page 377 of vol. 1, where under *Cancer limbatus* he cited as a synonym '*Xantho granulatus*. Ruppell. Crust. Pl. 5, fig. 3 (ce nom spécifique étant un double emploi, nous avons préféré celui sous lequel nous avons depuis longtemps désigné ce Crustacé dans la collection du Muséum)'.

I agree that *Panopeus herbstii* is a replacement name, but as it was not expressly proposed as such, it need not automatically be referred to the same type as *Cancer panope*. Therefore I was justified in selecting an American specimen to be the type of H. Milne Edwards's species.

I believe we have to interpret Article 72d very narrowly so as not to bind the hands of subsequent authors. That provision, by predetermining the type of a species that has expressly been given a new replacement name, also predetermines a taxonomic decision, and it should therefore not be applied more widely than is strictly necessary.

COMMENT ON PROPOSED NOMENCLATURAL VALIDATION OF
CAPSUS ATER JAKOVLEV, 1889 AND *LYGAEUS*
QUADRIPUNCTATUS FABRICIUS, 1794. Z.N.(S.) 2148
 (see vol. 38, pp. 288–291)

(1) By L.B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie*,
 Leiden, Netherlands)

Capsus ater Jakovlev, 1889

There is no doubt that *Deraeocoris limbicollis* Reuter, 1901, is the correct name for *Capsus ater* Jakovlev, 1889. As according to Dr Kerzhner's paragraph 4 there is and was no uniformity in the use of a name for this species (both *ater* and *sibiricus* being used), why not follow the Code strictly and adopt the correct name? From the application I do not gain the impression that the species is either of great interest in applied science or otherwise very well known, so that a name change would not seriously upset current practice.

Lygaeus quadripunctatus Fabricius, 1794

In this case too there is no uniformity in the use of a specific name for the taxon involved. In recent years, judging by the proposal, three names have been used for the species: *quadripunctatus* Fabricius, 1794, *annulicornis* Sahlberg, 1898 and *annulatus* Carvalho, 1959. The first two are invalid junior homonyms and the third is a junior synonym.

The fact that both *limbicollis* Reuter (in *Deraeocoris*) and *confluens* Reuter (in *Adelphocoris*) have been or may be used for infrasubspecific forms does not matter at all, as both were proposed as subspecific names. The action of later authors does not affect their original status.

Any author who considered *Capsus ater* Jakovlev congeneric with *Cimex ater* Linnaeus would still have to reject Jakovlev's name, which could only be saved by the suppression of Linnaeus's name under the plenary powers.

(2) Reply by I.M. Kerzhner

Article 59b(i) of the Code protects current usage and permits the restoration under the plenary powers of 'historical' junior secondary homonyms replaced before 1961 if their replacement names are not used or only rarely used, or if the use

of those names is in conflict with current practice. I think that it is logical, even if not strictly laid down in the Code, to extend that principle to cases where the replacement name cannot be used because it is a junior homonym or junior synonym. I find no evidence that Article 59b(i) applies only to names of economic or other importance.

I think that if, as a result of nomenclatural (not taxonomic) confusion, two or more names are used for the same species, the nomenclatural validation of one of those names (preferably the oldest and most used) serves stability better than the introduction of a further name that has never come into use for the species.

Capsus and *Deraeocoris* are placed in different, generally accepted, subfamilies. The possible future taxonomic changes referred to by Dr Holthuis are rather theoretical and in my judgment their nomenclatural interpretation is covered by Articles 57 and 59c. I think (and Mr Melville is of the same opinion) that the nomenclatural validation of junior secondary homonyms under Article 59c(i) implies only the rejection of the replacement name proposed before 1961, and not the taxonomic validation of the name. But to avoid any doubts it will be best to modify my proposals as follows:

The Commission is now asked

(1) to use its plenary powers:

(a) to rule that the specific name *ater* Jakovlev, 1889, as published in the binomen *Capsus ater*, is not to be rejected as a junior homonym of the specific name *ater* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cimex ater*, by any zoologist who places those species in different genera;

(b) to suppress the specific name *quadripunctatus* Villers, 1789, as published in the binomen *Cimex quadripunctatus*, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *ater* Jakovlev, 1889, as published in the binomen *Capsus ater*, with an endorsement that it is not to be rejected as a junior homonym of *ater* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cimex ater* by any zoologist who places those species in different genera;

(b) *quadripunctatus* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Lygaeus quadripunctatus*;

(3) to place the specific name *quadripunctatus* Villers, 1789, as published in the binomen *Cimex quadripunctatus*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE THE GENDER
AND STEM OF *HELIOTHIS* OCHSENHEIMER, 1816 (INSECTA,
LEPIDOPTERA). Z.N.(S.) 2306

(see vol. 37, pp. 186–189)

By W. Reed (*International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics*,
Patancheru P.O., Andhra Pradesh 502324, India)

[The following is an extract from a letter sent by Dr Reed to Dr Nye on 21 January 1982. R.V.M.]

‘Your paper on the nomenclature of *Heliothis* was received with interest and